

REMARKS

Claims 2, 4-16, 18, 19, and 21-45 were pending as of the action mailed on January 10, 2008. Claims 2, 18, 36, 38, 40, 42-43, and 45 are in independent form. Claims 2, 18, 36, 38, 40, 42-43, and 45 are currently amended. Claim 24 is cancelled. Reconsideration of the action is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16, 18, 19, 25-27, 29, and 35-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0073157 ("Newman"). The Examiner rejected claim 6, 11, 15, and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Newman. The Examiner rejected claims 21-23, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Newman in view of Venolia "Understanding Sequence and Reply Relationships within Email Conversations: A Mixed-Model Visualization" ("Venolia"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Interview Summary

Applicant appreciates the courtesy of an in person interview conducted on April 8, 2008. Examiners Bullock and To, along with Applicant's representatives, Brian J. Gustafson and Arrienne Lezak, participated. During the interview the claims were discussed in view of the cited references. An agreement was reached regarding the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 24 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner noted that claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's identification of allowable subject matter in claim 24.

While Applicant does not concede to the correctness of the Examiner's rejections, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the independent claims to include features corresponding to those of claim 24. Consequently, each independent claim includes features identified by the Examiner as allowable. Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, Applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, Applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that Applicant agrees with any positions taken by the Examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 10, 2008

/Brian J. Gustafson/
Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 26183
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071